DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 587 SP 002 631

By-Pogue, Graham
Student Teaching: The State of the Art.
Note-11p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.65
Descriptors-*Field Experience Programs, *Student Teaching

This paper discusses the efforts of institutions to cope with seven problems faced by directors of student teaching programs. Problem 1, "What is a desirable sequence of student teaching experience and how can it be scheduled?" lists major developments and changes in all professional laboratory experiences including internship programs. Problem 2, "How can the efficiency of learning in professional laboratory experiences be increased?" notes the use of such techniques as closed-circuit TV, video tapes and motion pictures, microteaching, and simulation. Problem 3, "How can satisfactory facilities for student teaching be provided?" describes the increasing need for cooperation between colleges and school systems. Problem 4, "How can adequate supervision from the colleges and universities be provided?" notes the use of team supervision and the changing roles of college supervisors and clinical professors. Problem 5, "How can student teaching be adequately financed?" pinpoints questions regarding public vs. private responsibility, student fees, and federal funds. Problem 6, "What can be done to improve student teaching?" summarizes two theories of classroom supervision: a scientific analytic vs. an emotional emphasis approach to teaching. Problem 7 is "How can the student teaching program be utilized to bring about innovation and change in educational practices?" SP 002 691 is a related document. (JS) -

ED030587

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

STUDENT TEACHING: THE STATE OF THE ART

Graham Pogue
Director of Student Teaching
Ball State University, Indiana

Formal education in the United States is a tremendous enterprise. It represents the major effort of an extremely wealthy and complex society to maintain its status and to achieve its aspirations. Each year over two hundred thousand new teachers are needed to keep this enterprise operating. Obviously, the quality of these new teachers has much to do with the effectiveness of formal education. These new teachers, along with their colleagues, exercise almost complete discretionary authority in determining how our children shall be educated. Their decisions and actions determine whether the immense expenditure of time, effort, and money on our school system is a good investment or merely an irrelevant and outdated ritual, tolerated because schooling is thought to be good for our children.

The education of teachers, then, merits the concern and effort of our most thoughtful people. Possibly no other social enterprise is so crucial to our continued well-being as a nation in the modern world.

Of all the components of a teacher education program, the element considered most vital and essential is student teaching. Follow-up studies of beginning teachers reveal that student teaching was the most valuable course in their preparation programs. Superintendents and employing officials look to the student-teaching record as a major factor in the selection of new teachers. State licensing boards for teachers universally require student teaching as a part of their certification standards. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the NEA's National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards have made major efforts to improve programs of student teaching. Even such diverse critics of teacher education as James Conant and James Koerner agree that student teaching is a necessary element in a good teacher education program.

As flattering as it may be to work in a program of high social merit, most directors of student teaching programs realize they are facing some very difficult problems. It is these problems and the efforts of institutions to cope with them that are the subject of this paper.

The order in which the problems are listed has no particular significance. They are presented in the approximate order they arise as one becomes more deeply involved in the student-teaching program.

Problem I. What Is a Desirable Sequence of Student-Teaching Experiences and How Can It Be Scheduled?

Student teaching is a rather disruptive element in the college or university schedule. Most institutions of higher learning schedule classes for one hour, with occasional laboratory periods of two or three hours. Until recently, institutions tried to make student teaching conform to this schedule. Students were assigned to

SP002631

classes in a nearby school for one period each day. They hurried to their student-teaching assignment, taught the class, and returned to the college for their next class. This plan had the merit of causing a minimum disruption of the college schedule. Although some institutions continue to follow this pattern, it has been generally condemned as deficient, if not actually misleading, in that it does not provide the student with an adequate concept of his role as a teacher.

Most institutions have met this problem by adopting what is called a "block plan" or a "professional semester."[1] In this arrangement the student is freed from other college responsibilities and spends a period that varies from four to eighteen weeks participating all day in a student-teaching assignment. Such a program is generally regarded by those close to student teaching as vastly superior to the "run in and run out" plan described above.

Student teaching is generally scheduled during the senior year. In the opinion of most student teachers and professional educators, this experience should come earlier in the curriculum. When taken earlier, it helps students decide whether they really want to be a teacher and motivates and directs their subsequent study. A number of logistic considerations makes this difficult to accomplish. If anything, the tendency has been to delay student teaching until after the completion of four years of college study.

The value of many experiences with children and young people prior to student teaching has long been recognized in teacher education. Some normal schools introduced such experiences as a part of the preparatory program almost a century ago. It remained, however, for the Flowers Report of 1948 sponsored by the American Association of Teachers Colleges (subsequently the AACTE) to elaborate the need for a systematic sequence of direct experiences with young people in school and community settings as an essential part of the teacher education curriculum.[2] In this report, "professional laboratory experiences" was used as an inclusive term to designate all the direct experience with children, youth, and adults that should be provided for students preparing to teach. Student teaching became only one aspect of this sequence. The terms prestudent-teaching experiences and poststudent-teaching experiences were introduced with obvious denotations.

The vigorous efforts of the AACTE and the Association for Student Teaching to implement the recommendations of the Flowers report were effective in bringing about some fairly substantial changes in the program of professional laboratory experiences. The major developments may be summarized as follows:

---

[1]Readers interested in more precise data are referred to the recently completed study of student-teaching programs: Johnson, James A. A National Survey of Student Teaching. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research Project No. 68182, Grant No. OEG 3-7-068182-2635; 1968.

[2]Flowers, John G., chairman. School and Community Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. American Association of Teachers Colleges. 1948. 261 pp.

1. Laboratory or campus schools were utilized more intensively for prestudent-teaching laboratory experiences and much less commonly for student teaching.

2. The movement toward scheduling student teaching as a full-time experience over a period of weeks and away from one- or two-hour daily assignments was accelerated.

3. Community agencies and neighborhood schools were used to a greater extent for prestudent-teaching experiences.

4. Relatively minor advancements were made in poststudent-teaching laboratory experiences.

About the same time these changes in the sequence of professional laboratory experiences were taking place, the Ford Foundation launched the Arkansas Experiment to promote fifth-year internships for prospective teachers. This program was conceived as a substitute for, rather than an addition to, the sequence of laboratory experiences advocated in the Flowers report. Without reviewing the ideological conflict that was waged over this plan, it is worth noting that several teacher education institutions developed internship plans during the depression years of the 1930's when there was an oversupply of teachers. These programs followed a regular student-teaching experience and were viable as long as there was a supply of unemployed prospective teachers willing to work for a small stipend with the expectation that the experience would enhance their opportunities for employment in following years. No supplementary financing was needed. With the advent of World War II, these programs were discontinued for obvious reasons.

Today there is widespread acceptance in professional circles of the need for internship programs in the preparation of teachers. There is less agreement as to how internship programs should be fitted into the total sequence of professional laboratory experiences. Some doubts exist as to the feasibility of internship programs of sufficient size and scope to accommodate the large number of new teachers needed in our schools each year.

Several teacher education institutions in Michigan have developed internship programs as an integral part of an extended sequence of laboratory experiences.[3] Most of these programs have been developed for students preparing for elementary teaching. Difficulties are encountered, both in scheduling and in placement of the interns, when a similar sequence of laboratory experiences is being designed for large numbers of students preparing for teaching in secondary schools.

Most internship programs at the secondary level are small, rather heavily funded operations designed to encourage liberal arts graduates without preparation

---

[3] Nash, Curtis, and Atterman, Rolland. "The Central Michigan University Project Presentation." Research and Professional Experiences in Teacher Education. Bulletin 20. Cedar Falls, Iowa: Association for Student Teaching, 1962.

in professional education to qualify for teaching positions. As these programs expand in size they become difficult to manage. When it becomes necessary to place interns at some distance from the college campus, the problems of providing for adequate supervision and related professional study become quite complex. The State of Wisconsin appears to be an exception.

The Wisconsin Internship Program deserves careful study.[4] The number of participants in the program has grown quite markedly in the past few years. Some reports indicate that the internship takes the place of student teaching. If so, the plan for supervision of these interns and the necessary compromises in the execution of this plan need to be examined. Perhaps it represents a model of statewide cooperation in teacher education that other states might emulate.

The value of an extended sequence of professional laboratory experiences is clearly recognized by those who work intimately with student teachers. The practical difficulties in developing a satisfactory sequence have tested the ingenuity of those responsible for the program.

Problem II. How Can the Efficiency of Learning in Professional Laboratory Experiences Be Increased?

The increase in scope and sequence of the professional laboratory experience program described above is not without its hazards. The time spent in these experiences may be vastly out of proportion to the actual learning that takes place. It might be possible to develop simulation devices which not only would reduce the amount of time devoted to professional laboratory experiences but would also give greater assurance that the desired learnings have taken place. If so, how and where should these devices be used in the professional laboratory experience program?

Institutions that have hoped to solve part of the problem of providing professional laboratory experiences by installing closed-circuit television to pipe actual classroom situations into college classes have generally been disappointed with the results. Better results have been obtained with video tapes or motion pictures presenting problems to which the students must react. The Oregon Project for sequential showing of classroom scenes in terms of the viewer's response appears to have merit, although beset with some technical difficulties.[5] The Science Research Associates Simulated Teaching Packet may have value for promoting in-depth study and reaction to an ongoing classroom situation.[6]

---

[4]University of Wisconsin, Madison.

[5]Twelker, Paul A. "Simulation Applications in Teacher Education." Salem: Oregon State System of Higher Education, Teaching Research Division, n.d., 22 p. (Mimeographed)

[6]Teaching Problems Laboratory. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

The Stanford University Microteaching Project for the development of specific teaching skills comes near to the reality of classroom teaching.[7] Students have the opportunity to practice certain identified teaching skills with a small number of pupils. Video-tape replay permits them to study their performance and to attempt to improve their next presentation. The rationale of microteaching is in marked contrast to the beliefs of educators who are more heavily committed to the attitudinal and emotional aspects of teaching, but it may be possible to effect a combination of these seemingly contradictory points of view.

At this stage of our professional development, simulation techniques offer great promise, but their actual utilization has not progressed very far.

Problem III. How Can Satisfactory Facilities for Student Teaching Be Provided?

As noted above, few, if any, teacher education institutions conduct their student-teaching programs in campus-controlled laboratory schools. Instead, the assignment of student teachers has been to an ever-widening circle of public and private schools around the campus. It is now quite common for student teachers to be assigned to schools one hundred or more miles from the college or university they attend.

On the whole, this move has been very beneficial to teacher education. The most valuable outcome has been to demonstrate to a large segment of the teaching profession that the responsibility for teacher education is not confined to institutions of higher education alone but is a responsibility that must be shared by the entire teaching profession. Some of the benefits derived from the greater awareness of this responsibility have been (a) greater interest and efforts by professional organizations to improve the quality of teacher education programs in the colleges and universities; (b) more encouragement by classroom teachers and guidance workers of high school graduates with good teaching potential to attend institutions with high-quality teacher education programs; (c) local efforts by supervisors and administrators to improve the quality of the student-teaching programs in their schools; and (d) greater recognition at the local level of the need for better programs of in-service education for the student teachers as they move on into their first year of teaching.

As the radius of areas to which student teachers are assigned has increased, there has been much overlapping of areas where two or more teacher education institutions have assigned student teachers. It is not at all unusual for ten or twelve such institutions to be using the same public school system. This creates some problems.

---

[7]Kallenback, W. W. Microteaching as a Teaching Methodology. Conference on Instructional Methods and Teacher Behavior. Laboratory for Educational Research Development, 1966.

First, lack of continuity developes in the use of supervising teachers. Usually school officials accept student teachers on a first-come, first-served basis. Consequently the colleges are not able to maintain a stable corps of supervising teachers. There is little opportunity for supervising teachers and college representatives to learn to work together comfortably and effectively. The college representatives experience great difficulty in making any effective impact on the quality of the student-teaching experience.

In addition, the programs of student teaching vary a great deal from one institution to another. The dates for starting student teaching, the number of weeks to be spent in the school, the rate of pay for supervising teachers, the recommended procedures for conducting student teaching, the philosophy of supervision, the amount and quality of prestudent-teaching laboratory experiences, the amount and quality of supervisory assistance provided by the college or university, the educational qualifications required of the supervising teacher--all these aspects, and many more, differ greatly from institution to institution. To quote from a recent national survey of student teaching:

> Student teaching assignments range from 6 weeks at some schools to 18 weeks at others; total clock hours spent in student teaching range from 180 hours to over 500 hours; payments to cooperating teachers range from nothing to several hundred dollars per student teacher; some institutions would not think of having graduate students supervise student teachers whereas at other institutions over 90% of the supervision is done by graduate students.[8]

This diversity leaves conscientious school administrators who desire to provide high-quality student-teaching experiences in a quandary. How can they conduct a good orientation program for student teachers when students report from different colleges and universities on dates that may be strung out through the entire semester? How can they conduct an in-service program for supervising teachers when the expectations of the officials in the preparing institutions differ? How can they explain to a supervising teacher why he receives less than one-half the amount of payment for his services that is paid to the teacher next door whose student teacher comes from a different institution? What action should be taken when a student teacher is failing to perform satisfactorily? From the viewpoint of the public schools the situation appears chaotic.

As student-teaching programs have spread out to include more and more schools, the need for rethinking our organization for student teaching becomes more critical. It is obvious that a cooperative effort is needed. But how is this cooperation to be achieved?[9]

---

[8]Johnson, op. cit., p. 52.

[9]Joint Committee on State Responsibility for Student Teaching. Who's In Charge Here? Fixing Responsibilities for Student Teaching. A Discussion Paper. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, National Education Association, 1966.

Problem IV. How Can Adequate Supervision from the Colleges and Universities Be Provided?

As noted earlier, supervisory loads of the college or university representatives may vary from less than five to nearly one hundred student teachers. In fact, some institutions make no pretense of visiting their students during their student-teaching assignment.

Furthermore, the arrangements for supervision may vary a great deal among the institutions assigning student teachers. At the most general level, one college coordinator visits all student teachers from the institution in a given geographical area. He may have his residence on the campus and drive to visit his student teachers, he may have a permanent residence in the geographical area he serves, or he may take up temporary residence at a student-teaching center during the period of student teaching.

At a more specialized level, special subject supervisors visit and supervise only those student teachers in their area of specialization. Usually these supervisors reside on the campus and drive to visit their student teachers. (Conant has used the term clinical professor to apply to these supervisors and endowed them with almost supernatural powers and instant status which, if realized, would solve many problems of teacher education. His recommendation may be similar to our tendency to envision the all-wise guidance worker as the utlimate solution of all problems of common school education.)

Sometimes general supervisors and special subject supervisors work cooperatively. In such cases, the general supervisor usually takes over the administrative responsibilities for the program and the special supervisor makes one or more visits to the students majoring in his field.

Finally, the practice of team supervision is coming into favor in some institutions. In this plan, a team of specialists made up of representatives from the field of methodology of teaching, educational foundations, the subject disciplines, psychology, and others work together to improve the work of the student teacher and classroom supervising teacher.

The problem of the director of student teaching is twofold. First, he must secure supervisory personnel qualified to work effectively with student teachers. Then he must arrange to use their services efficiently.

Securing qualified personnel presents some difficulties. While many capable individuals enjoy working with student teachers, the realities of the supervisory work often discourage them. In the first place, they are either forced to spend much of their time driving to and from schools situated at some distance from the campus, or they are compelled to take up residence at a center away from the campus and to sever their other connections with campus life. If their loads are heavy, they develop feelings of ineffectiveness, guilt, and lack of satisfaction with their job. After a short time they seek positions teaching classes on campus or go in for the more heady opportunities in the world of government or foundation grants.

The problem is accentuated by the low status sometimes afforded student-teaching supervisors on college and university campuses. As noted earlier, super-

vision of student teaching is often relegated to doctoral students. As these candidates complete their degrees, they are inclined to look askance at opportunities to supervise student teachers at institutions trying to uphold the status of these positions. Those who do go into supervision often find that little reward comes from being a good supervisor. The more visible research, writing, and promotional activities hold far greater opportunities for professional recognition on a college or university campus.

There are, of course, a great number of public school supervisors and administrators who would make excellent supervisors of student teachers. Unless they are ready to retire, the realities of status on the campus and the compensation deriving therefrom act as deterrents to securing the services of these potential supervisors.

Arranging to use supervisory personnel efficiently is a major problem of the institution. If supervision is to be done from the campus, a great deal of the time of relatively well-paid personnel is consumed in driving to and from the student-teaching assignments. To the degree that this supervision becomes specialized, the time wasted in travel is increased. Instead of one supervisor traveling to the school in which student teachers are assigned, there may be three or four specialized supervisors who would need to make the same journey.

A further problem in the efficient use of personnel developes in determining what the role of the supervisor should be. If his role is conceived to be that of working primarily with the student teacher, then he must return term after term with little permanent improvement in the student-teaching situation. Greater efficency and long-term benefits would appear to accrue from his working with the classroom supervising teachers and administrators. In most cases, the supervisor probably does a little of both. This is an area, however, in which role expectations are not clear. Expectations vary from school to school and from one college campus to another. The role of the college supervisor needs to be clarified.

Problem V. How Can Student Teaching Be Adequately Financed?

Good programs of student teaching are relatively expensive. Costs include payments to supervising teachers that may vary up to several hundred dollars; salaries of college and university supervisors which, with reasonable supervisory loads, will amount to more than $300 per student; travel expenses for supervisors and occasionally for student teachers; in-service workshops and conferences for supervising teachers; printed guidebooks and other materials for use in the program; and administrative overhead. The teacher education institution must determine how much it is willing to spend on the student-teaching program and how the funds are to be obtained.

Opinions differ as to the appropriate source of funds for the conduct of the student-teaching program. Some would contend that the public is the beneficiary of good programs of student teaching and, consequently, that the program should be largely subsidized by public funds. Of course, such funds are usually not available to private institutions. Recognizing the apparent injustice of this situation, a few states bypass the teacher education institutions and appropriate funds di-

rectly for the support of student-teaching program. The issue involves some philosophical questions as to the nature of public and private responsibilities in our society which, as yet, are unresolved.

In practice, most institutions derive funds for student teaching in whole or in part from student fees. This practice is justified on the premise that it is the student who benefits in terms of additional income in later life.

Fees may be imposed either as a regulatory device or as a means of defraying the high costs of student teaching. When used as a regulatory device, it is customary to impose a nominal fee of from $25 to $50 in addition to regular tuition fees, to prevent such practices as enrolling in student teaching with no intention of entering teaching, transferring to the institution for a short time to take student teaching when the costs are higher at the institution of original enrollment, and capriciousness in withdrawing from student teaching a short time before the term begins. Where student fees are imposed primarily to defray the cost of the program, it is customary to charge the student the amount paid to the supervising teacher, in addition to the regular tuition.

For the most part, student-teaching programs have not been recipients of federal funds. The total amount of money from all grants to support research in student teaching among 847 institutions participating in a recent study was only $61,430.[10] This figure may increase if funds are appropriated for implementation of the Education Professions Development Act. Until such time as funds are forthcoming, it is likely that individual state governments will have to bear the cost of any major thrust to improve the quality of student teaching within state boundaries.

Problem VI. What Can Be Done To Improve the Student's Teaching?

In practice, much classroom supervision is carried on by intuition. The efficacy of this supervision depends almost entirely on whether the intuitive capabilities of the supervising teacher and college supervisor are appropriate for the situation that exists. To overcome the rather haphazard quality of supervision that results, two contrasting theories of supervision have developed.

One theory would hold that teaching is subject to scientific analysis. Early attempts to apply this theory led to the development of innumerable checklists and rating scales to indicate the presence or absence of some element that was thought to be essential to good teaching. For the most part these elements were normative and produced instruments of very low reliability and validity. Recently, attempts have been made to develop new concepts that are descriptive of what teachers actually do in the classroom. Much attention has been focused on these relatively new tools for intellectual analysis of classroom teaching.

As yet, these newer concepts have been little used in the supervision of student teaching. Flanders' technique of interaction analysis is perhaps the most

---

[10] Johnson, op. cit., p. 25.

widely known and simplest to use. A recent survey shows that it is used "a good deal" or "extensively" in only 10 percent of student-teaching programs.[11] Utilization of Taba's "teaching strategies" is reported as only 5 percent for similar categories. While no figures are available, it is likely that Smith's "logical aspects" and Bellack's "teaching moves" have seen little practical application in student-teaching programs. As yet, the potential of scientific analysis of teaching appears to be largely unrealized in student-teaching programs.

In contrast to the scientific-analytic study of teaching is the approach that emphasizes the uniqueness of teaching situations. It places major emphasis upon the emotional aspects of teaching. Given a teacher with strong commitments to the potentialities of the learner, to the use of intelligence in solving problems, to the need of children for emotional support, to the importance of what is being taught, to the conviction that teaching is the most important profession in our society--given this strong drive to use the teaching situation for the benefit of the pupils--the teacher will find many more ways to achieve his ends than could possibly be taught him in the study of the science of teaching.

This point of view leads to a different emphasis in the supervision of student teaching. Supervisors with this point of view place little stress on methods of teaching. Instead, they are concerned with the feelings and emotions of the student teacher. They lead the student to examine the feelings that underlie certain teaching behaviors. They try to provide experiences that will lead to greater empathy with pupils. In short, they try to produce in the teacher a dynamic force which reacts upon the personalities in the classroom in many unforeseeable and unpredictable ways to help the pupils grow into more effective human beings.

Which of these two contrasting viewpoints of supervision is more effective? We don't know. Perhaps it is merely a matter of sequence. Until the motivations, the emotional aspects of teaching, are harmonized within the student teacher, a more scientific-analytic study of the teaching process is not likely to be fruitful. After this has been accomplished, the student teacher may eagerly seek all the scientific-analytic help he can find.

Problem VII. How Can the Student-Teaching Program Be Utilized To Bring About Innovation and Change in Educational Practices?

In theory, our most intelligent critics and students of education make up the faculties of our teacher education institutions. Prospective teachers studying under their tutelage should learn new and better ways of teaching. Student teaching should provide the opportunities to test these ideas in practice. How well are we accomplishing this objective in student teaching?

Most student-teaching programs probably tend to be quite conservative and to reinforce the status quo in educational practice. Three aspects of the problem need consideration.

---

[11] Johnson, op. cit.

First, student teachers are usually placed with supervising teachers who are considered to be good teachers. These good teachers are encouraged to, and to some extent do, give the student teacher some degree of freedom to try out his own ideas and to develop a style of teaching fitted to his individual personality. In practice, however, the range of variation from the established pattern of the supervising teacher is likely to be quite limited. Both the student teacher and the supervising teacher feel more comfortable and get along more harmoniously when both use somewhat similar classroom procedures. The result is a tendency to reinforce established teaching practices.

This is not to say that no changes are introduced by means of student teaching. Many supervising teachers like to have student teachers. They say, "I get so many new ideas and can keep abreast of new developments in my field." Nevertheless, the fact remains that student teachers, by and large, tend to imitate their supervising teachers.

A second type of problem arises when an attempt is made to introduce new subjects into the school curriculum. The schools can find few qualified teachers for these subjects. The teacher education institution, in turn, is faced with the dilemma of finding good supervising teachers in these subjects with whom to place their student teachers. The resulting stalemate tends to retard the development of many highly desirable programs. Very few states have agreed upon a procedure for eliminating this bottleneck.

At a more fundamental level, student teaching is the victim of the educational system. Schools are ongoing institutions with fairly well-defined role expectations that new teachers must be prepared to fill. But what if the system itself is faulty? Some believe that the school as we have known it is simply not an effective organization for educating deprived children. Are we guilty of what Warnette has described as "professional deformation" and Veblen has referred to as "producing trained incapacity"?

Certainly, one's point of view on whether the student-teaching program can be used effectively to bring about innovations and change in the schools depends upon his perception of the extent of change that is needed.

The problems I have raised may lead some readers to believe that student-teaching programs are beset with insoluble difficulties. Perhaps so, but the fact remains that very few states have made a concerted effort to attack these problems. The almost universal requirement of student teaching for state certification and its demonstrated importance for the development of good teachers indicate that a major attack on these problems would do much to improve the quality of teacher education.